

REMARKS

Claims 39, 41-45, 48-66 and 75-88 remain in the application. Claims 1-88 stand rejected. Claims 39, 51-53, 75, 76, 81-82 and 88 have been amended. Claims 40, 46-47, 67-74 have been cancelled. Claims 89 and 90 have been added.

Applicant believes the amendments don't add new matter. Support for the amendments is found in claims 40, 46-47 in the original filed application as well as at least Figs. 3A-G and 4 and associated description in the specification. Applicant particularly directs the Examiner's attention to Figs. 3F and 3G. The Applicant has cancelled and amended claims for the purposes of clarification and expediting prosecution. Applicant reserves the right to present cancelled claims in a future continuing applications.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Examiner rejected claim 59 in regards to the limitation "a first surface." Examiner says "there is insufficient basis for this limitation in the claim since the claims that 59 depend on never disclose 'a first surface.'" Applicant believes in the situation described by the Examiner, the use of the term, "a first surface," is correct because it is the first time the term is recited as noted by the Examiner. If Applicant is incorrectly interpreting Examiner's rejection, Applicant asks the Examiner to clarify to clarify in a subsequent office communication.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103

Claims 1-24, 26, 28-39 are rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by US 6,811,482, Letovsky.

Claims 39-48, 50, 61, 64-66, 75-83 and 86-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ellis (WO 02/32521).

Claims 49, 51-53, 67-68, 70, 72-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of US 2004/0048657 (Gauselmann).

Claim 71 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of US 2004/0048657 (Gauselmann) and in further view of 20040266515 (Gauselmann).

Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of 7,179,166 (Abbott).

Claims 63 and 84-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of 20040266515 (Gauselmann).

Claims 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Letovsky in view further skill in the art.

Claims 62 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view further skill in the art.

General Comments on Contents of Rejection

In making a rejection, the MPEP indicates an Examiner is supposed to indicate where in the cited prior art references each of the limitations of the claims are taught. Examiner, in their communication, didn't generally recite any language of the claims being examined. Thus, it is difficult for Applicant to follow Examiner's rejection and respond accordingly. Applicant respectfully requests in any subsequent communications where Examiner is indicating that a particular limitation is taught in the prior art that Examiner more clearly identify which limitation is taught at what section of the prior art reference.

For example, Applicant refers to item 1 under section claim rejections under 35 USC 102, which is a rejection of claims 1-9. It is difficult for Applicant to determine from Examiner's rejection where each of the limitations of claim 1 (repeated below), much less claims 1-9 are taught in the prior Art references. For brevity, Examiner's response is not repeated but Applicant notes the claim language below for claim 1 is not clearly identifiable in Examiner's response much less additional limitations in claims 2-9.

(Claim 1 as filed) In a gaming machine including a master gaming controller, a display device and a memory device, a method of generating a game of chance, the method comprising:

receiving a wager for the game of chance controlled by the master gaming controller on the gaming machine wherein the gaming machine is capable of receiving indicia of credit for the wager from an input device coupled to the gaming machine and outputting indicia of credit from an output device coupled to the gaming machine;

determining a game outcome for the game of chance by randomly selecting, one or more times, an index from a sequence of indices;

for each index selected, drawing a portion of the indices from the sequence of indices on one or more three-dimensional (3-D) objects in a 3-D gaming environment wherein the portion of indices includes the selected index;

rendering one or more two-dimensional (2-D) images derived from the one or more 3-D objects and the three-dimensional gaming environment as a game outcome presentation for the game of chance wherein information used to generate the one or more 3-D objects and the 3-D gaming environment is stored in the memory device on the gaming machine; and

displaying the one or more rendered 2-D images to the display device on the gaming machine wherein the 2-D images display the portion of the indices.

Claims as Amended and cited Prior Art

Claims as amended now describe, as recited in claim 39 for instance,

“determining randomly a final state on each of a plurality of virtual reel strips; for each virtual reel strip, a) determining a sequence of symbols to display from the virtual reel strip wherein each of the sequence of symbols comprises at least one of i) a number of symbols prior to the final state on the virtual reel strip; ii) a number of symbols after the final state on the virtual reel strip; or iii) combinations thereof; b) drawing the sequence of symbols over time on a surface comprising a planar rectangular surface or a curved portion of an outside of a cylinder defined in a 3-D gaming environment,

said drawing comprising; i) generating at least one of the planar rectangular surface or the curved portion of the outside of the cylinder at a first position in the 3-D gaming environment; wherein the planar rectangular surface or the curved portion of the outside of the cylinder is divided into a number of segments and wherein the number of segments is less than a total number of segments associated with the virtual reel strip; ii) selecting a first subset of symbols from the sequence of symbols to draw in the segments of the planar rectangular surface or the curved portion of the outside of the cylinder; iii) drawing the first subset of symbols in the segments of the planar rectangular surface or in the segments of the curved portion of the outside of the cylinder; iv) moving the planar rectangular surface or the curved portion of the outside of the cylinder including the first subset of the sequence of symbols from the first position to a second position in the 3-D gaming environment, v) generating the planar rectangular surface or the curved portion of the outside of the cylinder at the first position in the 3-D gaming environment; vi) selecting a second subset of symbols from the sequence of symbols

to draw in the segments of the planar rectangular surface or the curved portion of the outside of the cylinder; vii) drawing the second set of symbols in the segments of the planar rectangular surface or the segments of the curved portion of the outside of the cylinder a second subset of the sequence of symbols; viii) moving the planar rectangular surface or the curved portion of the outside of the cylinder including the second subset of the sequence of symbols from the first position to the second position in the 3-D gaming environment; wherein the first subset and the second subset are defined so that when a plurality of 2-D images are rendered from the 3-D gaming environment to capture the movements of the planar rectangular surface or the curved portion of the outside of the cylinder are viewed on the display screen, the symbols drawn on the planar rectangular surface or drawn on the curved portion of the outside of the cylinder appear to enter and to leave the display screen in an order specified by the sequence of symbols determined for each virtual reel strip.”

The pattern of motion and the way the symbols are selected and rendered in the 3-D gaming environment as recited in the pending claims are not taught or suggested in the prior art references alone or in combination. An advantage of using the method above is that it simplifies the rendering process in 3-D. Rather than simulating an entire reel with all its symbols and its associated motion, the effect of a spinning reel is generated using the planar rectangular surface or the curved portion of the outside of the cylinder “wherein the planar rectangular surface or the curved portion of the outside of the cylinder is divided into a number of segments and wherein the number of segments is less than a total number of segments associated with the virtual reel strip.” For instance, in one embodiment, a motion of a reel with 40 or 50 symbols may be simulated in the 3-D gaming environment using a planar rectangular surface or the curved portion of the outside of the cylinder divided into 5 segments (see Figs. 3F and 3G) as opposed to using a planar rectangular surface or the outside of an entire cylinder divided into 40 to 50 segments. Therefore, for at these reasons, Applicant believes, the claims as amended are not anticipated and can’t be said to be rendered obvious over the prior art cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/David P. Olynick/
David P. Olynick
Reg. No. 48,615

Beyer, Weaver, LLP
P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100